

## REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that the specification does not teach the ways of “handling” of the user data. In response, Applicants deleted the word “handling” from the claim language and inserted “writing” which is supported in the specification. Support for this amendment can be found on page 8, line 7 et. seq. and page 25, lines 1-9. For this reason, withdrawal of the §112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-8 and 17-20 is respectfully requested.


Claims 1-8 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. More specifically, the Examiner objects to the phrase “in the same way as handling of the user data” as being vague and indefinite because the claim language does not define the ways of handling the user data. In response, Applicants amended independent claims 1, 17 and 20 to delete handling and insert writing, as discussed above, and further clarify that the way of writing of the user data is different from a way of writing servo data. Support for this amendment can be found in Applicants’ specification on page 8, line 7 et. seq. Based upon these amendments, withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 1-8 and 17-20 is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

  
Joseph P. Fox  
Registration No. 41,760

September 7, 2007  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978